

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1, 7, and 8 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-5 and 7-12 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1 and 8 are independent.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments do not add new matter to the application and are fully supported by the specification. Support for the amendments may be found at least in Figures 3-4 and at page 7, lines 6-9; page 8, lines 1-5; and page 9, lines 4-14 of the specification.

In view of the above amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,792,986 issued to Garner, *et al.* ("Garner").

In order for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) to be proper, a single reference must disclose every claimed feature. To be patentable, a claim need only recite a single novel feature that is not disclosed in the cited reference. Thus, the failure of a cited reference to disclose one or more claimed features renders the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection improper.

Garner fails to disclose every feature of claim 1 as amended. Claim 1 as amended recites, in relevant part, "a switch end to identify that the earphone/microphone set or the external device is electrically connected to the connection unit if the switch end is open."

Garner fails to disclose at least these features of claim 1 as amended.

In Garner, there is a transistor 150 shown in Fig. 2, but the transistor 150 is turned on only if the external accessory device 50 has a separate power supply. Garner, col. 6, lines 37-42. Thus, the transistor 150 does not disclose a switch "to identify that the

earphone/microphone set or the external device is electrically connected to the connection unit if the switch end is open.” Indeed, according to Garner, the UDC SENSE pin is directly connected to and monitored by the input to analog-to-digital converter 108, without any intervening switch end arranged there between. Garner, Fig. 2; col. 6, lines 11-16.

Moreover, although the examiner cites to Garner’s col. 6, line 17 to col. 7, line 36 in rejecting claim 7 (which previously recited a “switch end”), neither this cited portion nor any other portion of Garner discloses a “switch end to identify that the earphone/microphone set or the external device is electrically connected to the connection unit if the switch end is open.” Rather, Garner discloses at most that “the computer-controller radio 60 senses the connection.” See, e.g., Garner, col. 7, lines 29-30. This is insufficient to disclose these features of claim 1 as amended.

For at least this reason, Garner fails to disclose every feature of claim 1 as amended.

Garner also fails to disclose every feature of claim 8 as amended. Claim 8 as amended recites, in relevant part, “detecting that a switch end is in an open position to indicate that an earphone/microphone set or the external device is connected to the mobile terminal.” For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, Garner fails to disclose at least these features of claim 8 as amended.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 1 and 8. Claims 2-5, 7, and 9-12 each depend from one of claims 1 and 8, and are allowable at least for this reason. Since none of the other prior art of record discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 8, and all the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2, 5, 9, and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Garner in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,819,942, issued to Aotake, *et al.* (“Aotake”).

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 8 are allowable over Garner alone, and Aotake fails to cure the deficiencies of Garner as noted above. Hence, claims 2, 5, 9, and 10 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable base claims.

Claims 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Garner.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 8 are allowable over Garner alone, and the examiner’s modification of Garner fails to cure the deficiencies as noted above. Hence, claims 11 and 12 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable base claims.

CONCLUSION

A full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and all of the stated grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, all pending claims are allowable and the application is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below if it would expedite prosecution. Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/hae-chan park/

Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: June 3, 2009

CUSTOMER NUMBER: 58027

H.C. Park & Associates, PLC
8500 Leesburg Pike
Suite 7500
Vienna, VA 22182
Tel: 703-288-5105
Fax: 703-288-5139
HCP/WMH/YDC